



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/813,248

03/30/2004

Plinio Pimentel

3408.2.8

4822

21552 7590 09/22/2011

AUSTIN RAPP & HARDMAN
170 South Main Street, Suite 735
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

OKEKE, IZUNNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2432

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/22/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptocorrespondence@austin-rapp.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/813,248 | Applicant(s) PIMENTEL, PLINIO | |
| | Examiner IZUNNA OKEKE | Art Unit 2432 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13, 5-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McBrearty et al. (US-7647402), and further in view of Wright et al (US-20040123150).

- a. *Referring to claims 1, 13, 15 and 18:*

Regarding claims 1, 13, 15 and 18, McBrearty teaches in a computing device, a method for protecting sensitive files from unauthorized access (Col 2, Line 45-56.... protecting sensitive files from unauthorized access), comprising: detecting a connection of the computing device to an electronic device; accessing an authorized connection list (Col 5, Line 29-43... connection of a computing device to a database server based on an authorized list); determining whether the connection is identified in the authorized connection list; and if the connection is not identified in the authorized connection list (Col 5, Line 29-63... when a file request is made, a determination is made if the connection was authenticated based on the authorized list): accessing sensitive file information which identifies at least one sensitive file stored on the computing device, wherein the sensitive file is not identified until after the connection has been identified as not being in the

Art Unit: 2432

authorized connection list (Col 5, Line 30-63..... a connection request is first made to a file server and the requester is checked against an authorized list, after that, a file is requested and based on the authentication (authorized list), access to file is allowed or prevented); and preventing access to the at least one sensitive file identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task after the connection is not identified in the authorized connection list, wherein the at least one sensitive file continues to be stored on the computing device but the at least one sensitive file cannot be accessed when access is being prevented (See Fig 4, Col 4, Line 49-53 and Col 5, Line 45-48, Col 6, Line 10-19.... preventing access to the file by performing a prevention task if the requester is not authorized/identified (by the authorized list) and the file continues to be stored on the database).

McBrearty teaches access prevention for a file when the access connection is unauthorized. McBrearty does not teach the access prevention process for all the files (for instance, all the sensitive files) associated with that request. However, performing an access prevention task which affects all sensitive files to prevent unauthorized access is well known in the art. For instance, Wright discloses the encryption or hiding of all sensitive data when an unauthorized connection/location is detected (See Wright, Para 125-127.... hiding/encryption of all sensitive data files when unauthorized access/location is detected). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify McBrearty's system to perform the access prevention task on all the sensitive files as taught by Wright for the purpose of providing maximal security for the system by protecting all the sensitive files (not just one) when unauthorized access connection is detected.

a. Referring to claim 2, 16 and 19:

Art Unit: 2432

Regarding claims 2, 16 and 19, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein if the connection is not identified in the authorized connection list the method further comprises: detecting termination of the connection; and if the computing device does not have any other unauthorized connections, restoring access to the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information (See McBrearty, Col 6, Line 21-26.... following termination of the session, restoring the server to normal operations).

a. Referring to claim 3:

Regarding claim 3, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the connection occurs via a computer network (See McBrearty, Col 3, Line 64 thru Col 4, Line 19).

a. Referring to claim 5:

Regarding claim 5, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the connection is a direct connection (See McBrearty, Col 5, Line 30-33... direct system to database connection).

a. Referring to claim 6, 8, 17 and 20:

Regarding claims 8, 8, 17 and 20, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the access prevention task comprises locking the at least one sensitive file (See McBrearty, Col 6, Line 10-19.... access prevention task such as renaming the file, hiding the file or moving the file to another location)

a. Referring to claim 9 and 10:

Art Unit: 2432

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the sensitive file information is a reference to a directory in which at least one of the sensitive files is stored (See McBrearty, Col 3, Line 58-64).

a. Referring to claim 11 and 12:

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the authorized connection list comprises a list of at least one authorized network (See McBrearty, Col 3, Line 64 thru Col 4, Line 11.... authorization for a network and type such as internet web connection).

a. Referring to claim 14:

Regarding claim 14, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising:

providing the authorized connection list; providing the sensitive file information; and transmitting the authorized connection list and the sensitive file information to the plurality of computing devices via the enterprise network (See McBrearty, Col 5, Line 29-42.... Providing the connection list and protected file).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McBrearty et al. (US-7647402) and Wright (US-20040123150), and further in view of Elliott et al. (US-20030056095).

a. Referring to claim 4:

Regarding claim 4, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches the method of claim 3.

Art Unit: 2432

McBrearty does not teach the connection network as a wireless network and the device as a mobile device. However, Elliott teaches a method of securing encrypted files from unauthorized access where the connection is made through a wireless network and by a mobile device (See Elliott, Para 22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify McBrearty's method and invention to include support for a wireless network and a mobile device as the client as taught by Elliott for the purpose of improving the system by incorporating wireless devices as client device making request for access to files on the sever.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McBrearty et al. (US-7647402) and Wright (US-20040123150), and further in view of Kung (US-5265159)

a. Referring to claim 7:

Regarding claim 7, the combination of McBrearty and Wright teaches performing an access prevention task on sensitive files when an unauthorized access is made to a file. McBrearty does not teach one of the access prevention tasks as encrypting the sensitive file. However, deletion of sensitive file by encrypting the files to prevent unauthorized access to the file is well known in the art. For instance, Kung discloses an access prevention task of deleting a file by encrypting the file to prevent unauthorized access to it (See Kung, Abstract). Therefore, one of ordinary skill would be motivated to modify McBrearty's access prevention task to include the task of encrypting the file to prevent access to the file thereby protecting the file from unauthorized access.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **IZUNNA OKEKE** whose telephone number is (571)270-3854. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 270-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2432

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/IZUNNA OKEKE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Minh Dinh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432